DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 877 CS 005 463

AUTHOR Flor, Romaine A.
TITLE A Review of the Literature concerning Grouping Plans for Elementary Reading Instruction, 1965-1979.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 35p.; M.A. Thesis, Kean College

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; *Grouping (Instructional Purposes); Heterogeneous Grouping; Homogeneous Grouping; Literature Reviews; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Research

ABSTRACT

Twenty-one studies of the effectiveness of various grouping plans for elementary reading instruction are reviewed in this paper. Following the review, the studies are summarized according to the grade level with which they dealt, and conclusions are drawn regarding the most effective grouping plans. Among the conclusions reported are: (1) no one plan was effective for all elementary grades; (2) beginning reading instruction in the first and second grades was most effective in self-contained classrooms with a limited number of pupils; (3) sex grouping for reading favored boys in the first grade and was detrimental to girls; (4) in grades three and four, reading instruction in small, homogeneous groups was effective, although individualized instruction and heterogeneous grouping were found effective for fourth graders; and (5) in grades five and six, homogeneous grouping for high-ability students and heterogeneous grouping for average and below average students were favored. (GT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED186877

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE CONCERNING GROUPING PLANS FOR ELEMENTARY READING INSTRUCTION, 1965-1979

BY

ROMAINE A. FLOR

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for

Master of Arts Degree in
Reading Specialization

KEAN COLLEGE

Spring, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Romaine A. Flor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS005463

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF FIGURES	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES	4
SUMMARY	22
CONCLUSIONS	27
BIBLIOGRAPHY	30

LIST OF FIGURES

	PAGE
Figure 1--Survey of Grouping Plans	29

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Does research indicate which type of grouping for reading instruction is most effective in grades one to six?

HYPOTHESIS

Homogeneous grouping within the same grade level is more effective in a remedial situation if the number of children is limited.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

The reading teacher has the option of scheduling groups for reading, therefore a study of the research data on grouping could provide a sound basis for scheduling children for this purpose.

DEFINITIONS

Non-graded - ungraded primary

An arrangement of classes with wider than usual age span and no regard for academic performance (Spache, 1973).

Sex grouping

Grouping children according to sex within the same grade level.

Homogeneous Grouping

Grouping children with similar ability. (reading ability or mental ability or both).

Heterogeneous Grouping

Grouping children without regard to achieving homogeniety in above factors (Kaluger and Kolson, 1969).

Indiividualized Reading

An organizational device for teaching children to read through individualized instruction.

Inter-class Grouping

Involves scheduling of reading lessons according to general level, ignoring age or maturity in combining children from several grade levels (Spache, 1973).

Vertical Grouping

Grouping along two or more grades.

Singly Graded

One grade level.

Achievement Levels

Progress made as shown on standardized testing of children.

Pupil Performance

Measure of an individual child on a standardized test.

Basal Reading Program

Systematic reading instruction provided in published materials in sequence or levels.

ASSUMPTIONS

The children used in the related research were representative of the student body.

The teachers responsible for teaching the various groups had equal experience.

LIMITATIONS

The research data used did not have equal time used for each experiment.

The number of children used in each study varied.

The number of boys and girls used in these studies varied.

The number of studies relating to the grouping plans being investigated varied.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES

GROUPING FOR READING INSTRUCTION

A study conducted in 1976, by Charles Mobley, was to compare the effects of multiage and homogeneous methods of grouping pupils for classroom instsruction in the primary department of Beaverbrook Elementary School in Griffin, Georgia. The controlled variable was the method used in grouping pupils. Six homogeneous age and seven multiage classes were established with pupils in their first, second, and third years of school. Both groups were pre-tested and post-tested in reading and mathematics achievement and self-concept. First year pupil's achievement gain was significant at the 0.03 level in favor of the multiage group. Pupils in their second and third years of school showed no significant gain in reading achievement; however, the mathematics gain favored the homogenous age group and was significant at the 0.02 level. Self-concept gain was significant at the 0.02 level in favor of the multiage group. The data were computed from a random sample of 120 pupils, approximately one-third of the population. A comparison of the two methods of grouping indicated the multiage method to be more appropriate for primary students in the school.

Robert T. Marish completed a study in 1971, to determine an analysis of the effects of vertical groups and reading achievement and attitudes in elementary school. One hundred and eight children from grades one through six were in the experimental group and grouped vertically, while 107 pupils from grades one through six were in the control group and singly graded. Each child was given a pre and post test. Results indicated that the organization, structure, teaching methods, and material were but supplemental ingredients in programs that seek to recognize and develop individual talents and potentialities. The major implication reaffirmed the crucial role the teacher plays in learning.

Data collected from another project were analyzed by Nichols in 1969, to study the effectiveness of inter-class grouping for reading instruction, especially for the primary grades. In the school using interclass grouping, children were randomly assigned in grades one, and two, to one of the three homeroom classes. For reading instruction, reassignment was made on the basis of readiness and of intelligence scores. In two other schools, used for comparison purposes, a self-contained plan was followed. Only children of above or below average intelligence and readiness scores were included in the analysis. The Word Meaning, Paragraph Meaning, Spelling, and Word-Study Skills sub-test scores on the Metropolitan Reading

Test were used as criterian measures of achievement. In both the above average and below average groups, achievement test scores favored the self-contained classes. No level of significance was reported.

A comparison of two approaches in up-grading reading instrsuction was completed in 1968, by N.J. Anastasiow. A cross-grade grouping plan and a self-contained classroom organization were both subjected to "up-grading" procedures by Anastasiow who had teachers place pupils in instructional groups near their level of achievement. Schools using the two different plans were selected on the basis of similar social class profiles and mean reading achievement. When total scores on the STEP reading tests were analyzed at the end of the year, no statistically significant differences were noted between the two plans. Both grouping procedures led to statistically significant gains (.001 level) over beginning of the year test scores.

In 1967, Joseph Justman conducted a study to determine the validity of ability grouping. One hundred and eighty one classes (4,705 pupils), homogeneously grouped was measured by the Standard Deviation of class performance on the first two Metropolitan Reading Tests given in two successive years. Growth was then determined by the difference in class means on the two tests. The same subjects were tested in grades three and four, and were divided into high, average, and low levels of achieve-

ment and degree of homogeniety. (A Standard Deviation of 6.0 through 8.9 months characterized "average homogeniety"). Findings showed an inconsistant growth pattern. On the word knowledge subtest, mean growth was practically identical for the average and low homogeniety classses. On the reading subtest, the low homogeniety classes showed greater growth than the average or high classes. Evidence of inconsistancy was obvious when various combinations of initial achievement level and class homogeniety were analyzed. It was therefore concluded that narrowing the range of ability in classes does not ipso facto improve pupil achievement. Programs designed specifically for the several ability levels are needed as a concomitant of ability grouping.

An experiment on homogeneous grouping for reading in elementary classes was completed by Berkun, Swanson, and Sawyer in 1966. An evaluation of reading ability affected by homogenous grouping was done by analyzing reading achievement of intermediate students. Four hundred and thirty one third, fourth, and fifth grade children were grouped homogeneously by reading ability and achievement and were compared with 657 controls grouped heterogeneously for reading instruction. Alternate forms of the California Reading Test were administered in September, in mid October as a reliability check, and again in

April. Each pupil's April score was adjusted to statistically equate the intitial levels of experimental and control groups so that observed differences in their adjusted means would represent an experimental effect. Analyses were made between experimental and control groups for each grade level separately and within grade levels for those pupils initially above and initially below their grade mean. Pupils in the experimental classes achieved an average of 0.4 years higher reading level than did the controll pupils. It was concluded that ability grouping appeared most advantageous at grades three and five.

W.R. Borg, in 1965, reported the results of a four year study on the effects of two typed of grouping systems upon achievement in various skill areas, including reading. Data were collected at each grade level from four through nine, and were analyzed by ability level, sex, and grouping plan. Approximately 4,000 pupils in grades four, six, seven, eight, and nine in two school districts which employed either a random grouping or an ability grouping system, were used in the study. Achievement was measured by the California Achievement Test the first year and by various tests in the STEP battery in subsequent years. Statistical techniques used were analysis of variance and covariance. In the summary of the detailed report, the

author concluded that neither grouping plan is more effective, although at the elementary level, pupils of superior ability fared better under the ability grouping plan, while slow pupils appeared to do better under a heterogenous grouping plan.

A study of the differences in achievement of 563 boys and girls in two non-graded public schools and one graded school in the same system, was completed in 1970, by E.B. Brody. In a comparison of achievement of 563 children in the first and second years of non-graded and graded schools, Brody found that pupils in a non-graded program performed better in general than did the pupils in a graded program when the groups of children were matched on intelligence. Mean scores were obtained on five subtests of the Stanford Achievement Test for each of the matched samples. At the end of the first year, the non-graded group achieved higher mean scores on all subtests of the SAT than did the graded groups, but statistical significance was not attained between the mean scores on Paragraph Meaning and Word Meaning subtests. At the end of the second year, the non-graded group achieved higher mean scores on all the subtests of the SAT, although scores on Paragraph Meaning and Spelling subtests were not statistically different. When the children were matched according to high and low intelligence ability, the second-year group seemed to gain more from non-grading than did the low

ability group, but the first-year pupils of low ability tended to gain more from non-grading than did the high ability group.

Jones, Moore, and Van Devender compared the effectiveness of a non-graded with a graded classroom organization in 1967. Included in the study were twenty-six elementary pupils in a non-graded organizational plan, and twenty-six in a control group. Subjects were entering first grade pupils and their teachers randomly assigned to either the graded or non-graded program. At the end of a year and a half, the Lee-Clark Reading Test and the Paragraph Meaning and Word Meaning subtests of the SAT, Primary Battery were administered. At the end of three years, pupils were given the Reading and Language subtests of the California Achievement Test. Results at the end of one and one-half years favored the non-graded groups at a statistically significant level on two of the three measures; at the end of the third year, differences favored the non-graded groups, but were not statistically significant.

In 1965, Hopkins, Oldridge, and Williamson determined the relative merit of graded and ungraded primary programs for achievement in reading vocabulary and comprehension. Four schools, two of each organizational plan and 230 primary grade pupils were used. At the beginning of the fourth year of the study, all pupils who had spent their entire schooling in the

same program were given the California Test of Mental Maturity and the California Reading Test, upper primary level. An analysis of covariance program permitted adjustment for any differences in intelligence between groups. No significant differences were found between mean scores of pupils in graded and in ungraded plans. Sociometric measures and pupil attendance records also showed no difference between groups. No difference on a teacher satisfaction scale were noted.

A preliminary evaluation of a non-graded primary school was done in 1965, by Ruth Machiele. Scores were compared on an achievement battery administered at the beginning of the second year beyond Kindergarten for one group of eighty-eight pupils in a non-graded primary program and one group of sixty-eight pupils in a graded program. Fifty pupils from each group were matched for I.Q., and their scores on Reading and Arithmetic subtests were also compared. Achievement test scores of children who had completed one year of any ungraded program were compared with records of pupils previously attending the same school under a graded plan. The California Test of Mental Maturity and the California Achievement Test were the instruments used to obtain intelligence and reading scores. When pupils in the two groups were paired on the basis of M.A. and C.A., children in the non-graded program had significantly higher scores for reading

vocabulary and comprehension.

An open-area education at the first grade level was evaluated by Bell, Switzer, and Zipursky in 1974, in a comparison of achievement between 112 beginners in traditional classrooms and fifty-seven in an open-area school. At school entry, both groups were matched in perceptual, motor, and cognitive skills and were from middle class families who did not differ significantly in socio-economic background. The tests used as criterion measures in reading were the Schonell Word Recognition and the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary A, Form I tests. Also administered was the Cooperative Mathematics Test 12A. Comparison of mean scores on the criterion instruments at the end of the school year, disclosed that the traditional group attained significantly higher mean scores in reading achievement than did those in the open-area school. No significant differences in the mean scores were found in number concepts. A comparison of percentages of children who scored below norms in reading in the two programs showed the failure rate for the open-area group to be twice as great as for the traditional group.

A study of seventh graders to compare attitudes and academic achievement of 170 students from traditional schools with fifty-seven students from an open-education school, was completed in 1974, by Samph and Campbell. The study also

included another ten students who had applied for admission to but did not attend the latter school. Four groups of students were identified according to their status in the elementary school. These included twenty-nine sixth graders who participated in an innovative curriculum and structure conducive to openness. Selected variables were used to assess achievement and attitude of students at the conclusion of seventh grade as is in a traditional educational setting. Two scores, Paragraph Meaning and the Mathematics Concepts, from the SAT were used to measure student's performance. Attitudes were examined with semantic differential adjective pairs in the form of a questionaire. Student's marks in various school subjects were also compared. The overall finding of the study was that an open-education experience in the elementary school had no measurable effect on seventh grade achievement or attitude of subjects in a traditional school program. No significant difference of mean scores were found on any comparisons among the groups.

Delores Warner, in 1976, compared actual gain with predicted gain on standardized academic achievement tests of sixteen boys and fourteen girls following one year of an experimental individualized instructional program. Subjects were third and fourth graders in a Title I school located close to a

federal housing project. The effectiveness of an experimental program to individualize instruction was investigated. The program included aspects of self-pacing, self-selection, self-direction, self-evaluation, self-discipline, and skill implementation. Actual gain with predicted gain was compared on a variety of standardized tests including the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (GMRT). Data were collected from pre and post testing conditions. The mean scores were compared and analyzed indicating significant increases in gain scores on the Vocabulary and Comprehension subtests of GMRT as well as an average gain of 16.6 months on the Spache Oral Test after eight months of actual instruction. Actual gain was reported greater than predicted gain.

A programmed diagnostic-prescriptive reading program was evaluated in 1975, by Eugene Penistan, in comparison with an open-classroom individualized reading program, using a total of thirty first-graders as subjects. Reading achievement was measured on a pre-post test treatment with the California Achievement Test. Instruction for the two treatment groups lasted approximately nine months. Single classification analysis of covariance model was used to compare post test results while controlling differences in pre-test scores. The analysis

of the data favored the diagnositc-prescriptive programmed approach, although both treatment groups made gains from pre-testing to post testing on the criterian variables.

A study of the effectiveness of individualized reading instruction upon self-concept of disadvantaged children with reading disabilities was conducted in 1973, by James Marion Marble. The one major purpose of this study was to investigate the possibilitiy that individualized instruction could improve the self image of children with reading problems. Subjects for the experimental group were selected from five classes of fifth grade students from a predominantly rural, isolated area in Mississippi. The Sears Self-Concept Scale was administered in a pre-post test design. Initial differences in scores were partitioned out of the pre-test measure. After nine months of individualized reading instruction, the self-image of the experimental group was examined again to determine if a significant difference existed. Under the conditions of the experiment, no significant changes on the Sears Self-Concept Scale were observed. The two null hypotheses predicting no significant differences between experimental and control groups and between boys and girls subgroups respectively, were supported.

The absence of significant differences was thought to be ascribed to the possibility that more than one year of reading success might be required before differences in self concept are noted.

Samuels and Turnure, in 1974, investigated sex differences in classroom attention and related it to reading achievement at first grade to determine if attentiveness accounted for greater reading achievement of girls. The subjects came from four classrooms using traditional basal reading instruction and included fifty-three first grade boys and thirty-five first grade girls. Attentiveness and word recognition were measured, then these two variables were correlated while controlling for readiness. Attentiveness was scored at four-second observed intervals during the reading hour, with fifteen visits to each classroom during a month. Task relevant behaviors (e.g. looking at text or teacher) were considered attentive, while closing eyes, playing with non-assigned materials, and the like were considered inattentive behaviors. The proportion of positive instances divided by the total of positive and negative was the score used. A reliability of raters of 89% was obtained. Reading achievement was determined by recognition of forty-five words randomly selected from the Dolch list of Basic Sight Words. The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test, Primary A, Form 1, provided

scores used as a covariate in analysis of word recognition, and in partial correlation. Attention scores were placed in four quartiles. The analysis showed no significant differences in readiness between boys and girls. Mean word recognition scores were higher for girls than for boys; these scores increased from the lower to the upper quartile of attention, as the difference in attention favored the girls. The important conclusion from this study for this report was the comparison of boys and girls.

A longitudinal evaluation of reading achievement in small classes, was done in 1969, by I.H. Balow. This evaluation was obtained by using staggered instructional periods. In the experimental groups, half of each class came one hour early for reading and language instruction, while the other half remained an hour later. All beginning first grade classrooms, experimental and control were given the Metropolitan Readiness Test (MRT). All grade two and three children were given the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), reading subtest, and grade four classes received the Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP). The California Short Form Test of Mental Maturity (CTMM) was administered to all second grades. After one year of instruction, the experimental group that had started the program in grade one scored significantly higher on the MAT than did the

control group. When all grades were analyzed by sex, the difference in achievement was found to be primarily for the boys rather than for girls and held true at grades two, three, and four. Grade three comparisons with second grade reading scores controlled for, indicated that experimental children gained more than did control children. However, there was no significant difference in MAT scores between classes who had been in the program one year only, and control classes. No significant differences were found between groups at the fourth grade level when grade three achievement was held constant. However, when STEP achievement was compared, with MRT and CTMM scores controlled for, statistically significant differences favoring the experimental groups were noted. The author concluded that the influence of the program was cumulative, i.e., the longer the child was in the program, the greater the benefit to him. It was also felt that the findings gave support to the idea that reduced class size was beneficial for children at all reading levels.

In 1967, Johnson and Scriven studied the effect of class size in English and Mathematics classes on achievement in reading and arithmetic. Reading comprehension was the dependent variable for the English classes. Some 7500 seventh and eighth grade pupils in 130 English and 135 Math classes were used to

ascertain the effect of class size. Classrooms were classified according to initial achievement, variability, and size. Gain in reading comprehension and arithmetic scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills were used as the dependent variables in English and in Math classes, respectively. In general, gain differences between large and small classes were not statistically significant. In both English and mathematics, seventh grade gains were the greatest for small classes (below twenty-nine), with greatest variability. In grade eight, gains were greatest for large classes (twenty-eight and over) with smaller variability. A further comparison made between the extremes of large classes (N=34 or more) and small classes (N=24 or fewer) confirmed the general findings of no significant difference in achievement due to class size.

Nita M. Wyatt conducted a study in 1965 to determine sex differences in reading achievement resulting from the use of two different approaches. A total of 633 first grade students were used in this study. A standard basal reader approach was used with reading groups divided by sex as well as ability. Pace and emphasis of instruction for the boys was adopted to suit their needs. A linguistic approach was organized to suit the aptitudes

of boys for transfer of skills and inductive reasoning. This approach was used with groups divided by ability only. There were two experimental groups of ten first-grade classes in each group. One control group of ten first-grade classes was also used. The instructional period was for 140 days, at the end of which achievement tests were administered. It was found that for word reading skills, boys in both experimental groups excelled the control group. The linguistic approach proved superior to the basal reader approach. Girls in all three groups had significantly higher means than the boys in the same group except for the test of paragraph meaning. On nearly every measure of achievement, the linguistic approach seemed more effective. Sex grouping was slightly advantageous for the boys, but appeared detrimental to the girls. The grouping plan of boys versus girls was the important conclusion drawn from this study.

Sister M. Marita, in 1966, conducted a study to analyze beginning reading achievement in three classroom organizational patterns, Scores were compared on pre and post instructional measures of reading readiness, achievement, and attitude for pupils in thirty classrooms who received reading instruction in one of three organizational patterns: modified individualized, three-to-five group, and whole class child-centered. The study

included 810 children for a period of 140 days. For each of the organizational patterns being compared, Sister Marita had ten heterogeneously grouped first grade classrooms. Special post-measures of attitude, attendance, and writing were included. Scores were significantly higher on the Word Study section of the Standford Achievement Test for the modified individualized and the whole class child-centered patterns than for the three-to-five group pattern. Children in the whole class pattern were significantly higher on the Word Meaning section of the SAT than were the children in the three-to-five group pattern. The results of this study indicated that no one grouping plan appeared to be the best in all areas.

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY

The summary of the reviews of grouping plans for reading instruction in the elementary school is presented by grades, beginning with grade one.

The results of the studies indicated that for Grade One, a diagnostic-prescriptive approach that was studied by Penistan and Nichols' study of children in a self-contained classroom, achieved significant gains in reading. Small class size was effective for reading in the study by Balow, although there was no significant difference found in the study completed by Marita when comparing reduced class size to a whole class. The studies of Mobley, Jones et al. and Brody favored a non-graded classroom for effective reading instruction, however no significant difference was noted in the studies completed by Maresh and Hopkins when non-graded was compared to singly-graded classes. There was no significant difference for reading in Marita's study when individualized instruction was compared to small group instruction or to whole class instruction. The studies for the open classroom and reading achievement, reviewed by Bell et al. and

Pensitan revealed that there were no positive gains resulting from this type of grouping. Bell's study further indicated that the failure rate was twice as high for children in Kindergarten and Grade One when compared to a traditional classroom. Grouping children by sex was found in Balow's study, to be better for boys in a reduced class, although Samuels and Turnure concluded that sex grouping in a traditional basal program favored the girls for attentiveness and word recognition. The study reviewed by Wyatt indicated that sex grouping favored boys and was detrimental for girls when two approaches to reading were compared.

For Grade Two, a review of the studies indicated that Balow's study for reading achievement in small classes and Nichols' study of self-contained classes were found to be effective. The studies by Brody, Jones et al. and Machiele showed significant gains favoring a non-graded class although studies completed by Maresh and Hopkins et al. revealed no significant difference between non-graded and singly graded classes as they relate to reading achievement. Balow's study of reduced class size, concluded that grouping by sex was better for boys.

The grouping plans reviewed for Grade Three indicated that small class size, studied by Balow and Warner's study of

individualized instruction were favored when compared to larger classes. Balow further concluded that small class size was beneficial to boys when grouped by sex. Homogeneous grouping was found to be advantageous for third grade in a study conducted by Berkun and Swanson, but a study completed by Justman indicated no significant difference in achievement by narowing the ability range. Studies by Maresh, Machiele, and Hopkins et al. indicated that no significant difference could be found when children's achievement was compared to reading in non-graded and singly-graded classes. However, the study conducted by Jones et al. favored the non-graded over the singly-graded classrooms.

For Grade Four, the study by Borg indicated that heterogeneous grouping was favored over homogeneous grouping. Warner's study indicated that individualized instruction was more effective for fourth graders when comparing actual gain in reading to predicted gain. Balow concluded in his study that small class size was favored over large classes in reading achievement. Homogeneous grouping for fourth graders was found to be effective in a study completed by Berkun et al., although the study by Borg indicated that homogeneous grouping was beneficial only to those students with superior ability. Justman's study of homogeneous grouping concluded that there was no significant difference in reading achievement when ability

ranges were reduced. In a comparison of non-graded with singly-graded classrooms, Maresh found no significant difference for reading achievement.

Studies reviewed for grouping and reading achievement for Grade Five indicated that homogeneous grouping was favored in a study by Berkun et al. and heterogenous grouping was found to be more effective when compared to random grouping in a study by Borg. Anastasiow compared an open classroom with a self-contained classroom and found no significant difference in reading achievement between the two plans for fifth grade students. No difference in achievement was found for non-graded classrooms in a study by Maresh who compared non-graded students with those singly graded. A study by Marble concluded that individualized instruction for disadvantaged children with reading disabilities was effective for reading, but no significant difference was found in the student's self concept after one year.

A study conducted by Borg for Grade Six students, concluded that homogeneous grouping for high ability students and heterogeneous grouping for average and below average students were beneficial for reading achievement. No significant difference was noted on the study for sixth graders when Anastosiow

compared self-contained students with those that were grouped cross-grade. The study be Berkun et al. concluded that there was no signficant difference in achievement when students grouped homogeneously were compared to students in a non-graded classroom. Maresh concluded in a study that compared non-graded with singly-graded clasrooms, that there was no signficant difference between the two in reading achievement or in attitude toward reading.

For Grade Seven, Samph and Campbell compared student's achievement in an open classroom with that of students in a traditional class. They concluded there was no significant difference. Borg's study of grouping Grade Seven and Grade Eight students both homogeneously and heterogeneously indicated that higher ability students achieved better in a homogeneous setting and average or below average students favored a heterogeneous grouping plan for reading. Johnson and Scriven completed a study that included both seventh and eighth grade students. They compared reading achievement with students in a reduced class size to those in a full class. No significant difference was found.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the most effective grouping plan for reading instruction in the elementary grades one to six.

The conclusions from the studies indicated that no one plan was effective for all elementary grades. (Figure 1, Grouping Plans)

The twenty-one studies reviewed, indicated that beginning reading instruction in the first and second grades was most effective in self-contained classrooms with a limited number of pupils. In addition, a study reviewed for a diagnostic-prescriptive approach in first grade proved to be effective. Sex grouping for reading favored boys in first grade and was detrimental for the girls. Studies for non-graded classes were almost equally divided for and against effective reading instruction. (Figure 1, Grouping Plans)

In grades three and four, grouping plans that were homogeneous, and small in number were found to be effective for reading, along with individualized instruction and heterogeneous grouping of fourth graders.

For grades five and six, homogeneous grouping for high-ability students was favored, with heterogeneous grouping for average and below average students.

Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected. Homogeneous grouping with a limited number of children was not more effective for reading instruction in grades one to six.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

A limited number of studies was reviewed for the various grouping plans. The number of children involved in the studies and the periods of time for each study varied.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that additional studies be conducted or reviewed to determine the most effective plan for reading instruction in the elementary grades of one to six.

GROUPING PLANS	GRADE ONE	GRADE TWO	GRADE THREE	GRADE FOUR	GRADE FIVE	GRADE SIX	GRADE SEVEN	GRADE EIGHT
HOMO-GENEOUS	-	-	- ✓	- ✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
HETERO-GENEOUS				✓	✓	- ✓	✓	✓
SMALL CLASS SIZE	- ✓	✓	✓	✓			-	-
INDIVIDU-ALIZED	-		✓	✓	-			
NON-GRADED	-- ✓✓✓	- - ✓✓✓	- - ✓	-	- -	-		
SELF CONTAINED	✓	✓			-		-	
DIAGNOSTIC PRESCRIP-TIVE	✓							

✓ Significantly effective

– No significant difference

Figure 1. Survey of Grouping Plans.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anastasiow, N.J. "A Comparison of Two Approaches in Up-Grading Reading Instruction." Elementary English 65: 495-499, April, 1968.

Balow, I.H. "A Longitudinal Evaluation of Reading Achievement in Small Classes." Elementary English 46: 184-187, January, 1969.

Bell, Anne E., F. Switzer and M. Zipursky. "Open-Area Education: An Advantage or Disadvantage For Beginners." Perceptual And Motor Skills 39: 407-416, August, 1974.

Berkun, M.M., L.W. Swanson and D.M. Sawyer. "An Experiment On Homogeneous Grouping For Reading in Elementary Classes." Journal of Educational Research 59: 413-414 Volume 8, 1966.

Borg, W.R. "Ability Grouping in the Public Schools: A Field Study." Journal of Experimental Education 34: 1-97 1965.

Brody, E.B. "Achievement of First and Second Year Pupils in Graded and Non-Graded Classrooms." Elementary School Journal 70: 391-394, Volume 9, 1970

Hopkins, K.D., O.A. Oldridge and M.L. Williamson. "An Empirical Comparison of Pupil Achievement and Other Variables in Graded and Ungraded Classes." American Educational Research Journal, 2: 207-215, 1965.

Johnson, M. and E. Scriven. "Class Size and Achievement Gains in Seventh and Eighth Grade English and Mathematics." School Review 95: 300-310, Volume 8, 1967.

Jones, J.C., J.W. Moore and F. Van Devender. "A Comparison of Pupil Achievement After One and One Half and Three Years In A Non-Graded Program." Journal of Educational Research 61: 75-77, Volume 8, 1967.

Justman, Joseph. "Ability Grouping-What Good Is It?" The Urban Review Volume 2, February, 1967.

Kaluger, George, and Clifford Kolsen. Reading And Learning Disabilities. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Company, 1969.

Machiele, Ruth B. "A Preliminary Evaluation of the Non-Graded Primary at the Teal School, Urbana." Illinois School Research 1: 20-24, 1965.

Marble, James Marion. "An Analysis of the Effectiveness of Individualized Reading Instruction Upon Self-Concept of Disadvantaged Children With Reading Disabilities." Ed. D. Dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1973.

Maresh, Robert T. "Analysis of Effects of Vertical Grade Groups on Reading Achievement and Attitudes in Elementary School." Ed. D. Dissertation, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, 1973.

Marita, Sister M. "Beginning Reading Achievement in Three Classroom Organizational Patterns." The Reading Teacher 20: 12-17 Volume 7, 1966.

Mobley, Charles F. "Comparing the Effects of Multiage and Homogeneous Age Methods of Grouping Pupils in the Primary Department of an Elementary School." Ed. D. Dissertation, Nova University, Georgia. April, 1976.

Nichols, Nancy J. "Interclass Grouping for Reading Instruction: Who Makes the Decision and Why?" Educational Leadership 26: 588-592 Volume 9, 1969.

Penistan, Eugene. "Developing Reading Skills for Low Socia-
E Economic Status First Grade Pupils." Reading Improvement 12: 98-102 Volume 5, Summer, 1975.

Samph, Thomas and Patricia Campbell. "Open Education: Students In Transition." The Elementary School Journal 75: 37-44 Volume 10, October, 1974.

Samuels, S.J. and James E. Turnure. "Attention and Reading Achievement in First Grade Boys and Girls." Journal of Educational Psychology 66: 29-32 February, 1974.

Spache, George D. and Evelyn B. Spache. Reading In The Elementary School Third Edition. Boston. Allyn and Bacon, Inc. 1973.

Spencer, Doris U. and L. Doris Moquin. "Individualized Reading Versus a Basal Reader Program at the First Grade Level in a Rural Community." Johnson State College, Vermont, 1965.

Warner, Dolores. "Pupilization of the Instructional Program." Reading Horizons 16: 97-103 Winter, 1976.

Wyatt, Nita M. "Reading Achievement of First Grade Boys Versus First Grade Girls Using Two Approaches-A Linguistic Approach and A Basal Reader Approach With Boys and Girls Grouped Separately." Kansas University, Lawrence, 1965.